

**Remarks/Arguments:**

The present invention relates to a recording/reproducing apparatus which compresses video and audio signals in a plurality of compression techniques. Specifically, there is also record management information which denotes a mutual association between the plurality of compressed signals.

On page 2, the Official Action rejects claims 1-10, 12-16, 20-23 and 25-27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Okita (JP Patent Application 2001169250) in view of Okazaki (U.S. Patent No. 5644506). On page 3, the Official Action rejects claims 1-10, 12-16, 20-23 and 25-27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Okita in view of Zetts (U.S. Publication No. 20020048450). It is respectfully submitted, however, that the claims are patentable over the art of record for the reasons set forth below.

Applicants' invention, as recited by claim 1, includes a feature which is neither disclosed nor suggested by the art of record, namely:

**... record management information that denotes a mutual association between said video signals that have the same contents but are compressed in a plurality of different bit rates ...**

Claim 1 relates to record management information which denotes a mutual association between a plurality of signals. Specifically, record management information is information that relates the signals which are compressed in a plurality of techniques. This feature is found in the originally filed application at page 28 line 23-page 29 line 10 and furthermore in Fig. 4C. No new matter has been added.

Applicants' would like to thank the Examiner for the telephone interview on April 15, 2008. During that interview Applicants' discussed the Okazaki and Zetts references with regard to the above highlighted feature of claim 1. After discussing Figs. 13 and 18 of Okazaki and Figs. 2 and 6 of Zetts, the Examiner agreed the references of record did not disclose the record management information as recited in claim 1 above. For example, Zetts teaches two different compression techniques (MPEG1 and MPEG 2), however, he does not teach record management information which denotes a mutual association between the two signals. Okazaki teaches a buffer and a decoder, however, does not teach record management information which denotes a mutual association between the signals. Thus, Applicants' claim 1 is different than Okazaki and Zetts, because of the record management information (*"record management information that*

*denotes a mutual association between said video signals that have the same contents but are compressed in a plurality of different bit rates")*. Record management information, for example, may include a file name and identifier as shown in Applicants' Fig. 4C and recited on page 29 lines 1-10 (*"stored as record management information including both file names in a record management file as shown in Fig. 4C. In addition, an identifier for identifying the program (SIML#1, in an example of Fig. 4) is also recorded"*).

It is because Applicants' include the feature of *"record management information that denotes a mutual association between said video signals that have the same content but are compressed in a plurality of different bit rates"*, that the following advantages are achieved. An advantage is the ability to correctly reproduce the video signals that are compressed in a plurality of different bit rates. Accordingly, for the reasons set forth above, claim 1 is patentable over the art of record.

Claims 16, 20, 25, 26 and 27 include the record management information feature recited in claim 1. Thus, claims 16, 20, 25, 26 and 27 are also patentable over the art of record for at least the reasons set forth above.

Claims 2-15 include all the features of claim 1 from which they depend. Thus, claims 2-15 are also patentable over the art of record for the reasons set forth above.

Claim 17 includes all the features of claim 16 from which it depends. Thus, claim 17 is also patentable over the art of record for the reasons set forth above.

Claims 21 and 22 include all the features of claim 20 from which they depend. Thus, claims 21 and 22 are also patentable over the art of record for the reasons set forth above.


Claim 23 includes all the features of claim 26 from which it depends. Thus, claim 23 is also patentable over the art of record for the reasons set forth above.

Appln. No.: 10/519,851  
Amendment Dated April 22, 2008  
Reply to Office Action of January 24, 2008

MTS-3472US

In view of the arguments set forth above, and the results of the telephone interview, the above-identified application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Jacques L. Etkowicz, Reg. No. 41,738  
Attorney for Applicant

RAE/nm

Dated: April 22, 2008

P.O. Box 980  
Valley Forge, PA 19482  
(610) 407-0700

NM247075